JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil coversheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except provided by local falls of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil do	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	F THIS FO	RM.)		,			
I. (a) PEAINTHFFS				DEFENDANTS					
Julia Lonoconus				Life Insurance Company of North America					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Worcester County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PILAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Frankel & Newfield, PC 585 Stewart Avenue, Sui Garden City, NY 11530	te 312	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Attorneys (If Kr	nown)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDA	CTION (Place on "X" in O	ne Box Only)				INCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff U.S. Government Not a Party) □ 2 U.S. Government □ 4 Diversity			Citize	(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF itizen of This State 1 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5					
Defendant		p of Parties in Item III)		n or Subject of a	0:		of Business In A		
				eign Country					
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) RTS	FC	RFEITURE/PENAI	LTY		here for: Nature of KRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 1385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETETION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General	XTY	5 Drug Related Seizur of Property 21 USC 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standard Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigati 1 Employee Retireme Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Appl 5 Other Immigration Actions	re 881	422 Appe	al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY-RIGHTS rights at at - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) & Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 29 U.S.C. §1001 Brief description of ca Failure to pay dis UNDER RULE 2	Appellate Court atute under which you at et. seq. (ERISA) ause: ability benefits IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P. JUDGE	re filing (1	pened A	Another (specify)	J		- Litigation - Direct File	
DATE 07/28/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	MOUNT	SIGNATURE OF AN	TORNEY C	PRECORD C	OGF		MAG JUE	OGE.	

JUL 31 2017

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

OR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to	be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpos
ssigninent to appropriate calendar.	
ddress of Plaintiff: 237 Teal Circle, Berlin, MD 21811	
ddress of Defendant: Two Liberty Place, 1601 Chestnut Street, Philace	delphia, PA 19192
ace of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Pittsburgh, PA 15342	-
(Use Reverse Side For	Additional Space)
oes this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a	7 7/1 / 1
loes this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? ELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Yesto No. X
ase Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
ivil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	year previously terminated action in this court?
is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending of within one	Yes No X
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
action in this court?	
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	Yes No. No.
terminated action in this court?	Yes No X
Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?
	Yes□ NotX
VIL: (Place ✓ in one Category only)	
Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
. D FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury
. Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
. 🗆 Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury
. 🗆 Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
. Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
. D Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
□ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
). □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
1. X All other Federal Question Cases	(a name of cond)
(Please specify) 29 U.S.C. §1001 et. seq. (ERISA)	,
ARBITRATION CER	
Jason A. Newfield (Check Appropriate counsel of record do hereby cer	
Rursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge an	d belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum
50,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
July 28, 2017	JAN5529
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	here has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
equific that to my broughdry the within ages is not unlated to any ages now and and	r within one year previously terminated action in this court
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending o	or within one year previously terminated action in this court
$(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O})$	
ATE: July 28, 2017	JAN5529
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#
CIV. 609 (5/2012)	JUL 31 2017.



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Julia Lonoconus		: CIVIL ACTION					
v.	1	:	119	220			
Life Insurance Company of N	orth America	:	NO.	339			
In accordance with the Civil Just plaintiff shall complete a Case M filing the complaint and serve a co side of this form.) In the event designation, that defendant shall, the plaintiff and all other parties, to which that defendant believes	lanagement Topy on all defe that a defend with its first a Case Mana	rack Designatendants. (See dant does not appearance, see appearance, see appearance)	ion Form in all civil cases as \$1:03 of the plan set forth of agree with the plaintiff resubmit to the clerk of court to Designation Form specify	at the time of on the reverse garding said and serve on			
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLL	OWING CA	SE MANAGI	EMENT TRACKS:				
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brou	ght under 28	U.S.C. § 2241	through § 2255.	()			
(b) Social Security – Cases reque and Human Services denying				()			
(c) Arbitration – Cases required	to be designa	ted for arbitra	tion under Local Civil Rule	e 53.2. ()			
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving of exposure to asbestos.	claims for per	sonal injury o	r property damage from	()			
(e) Special Management – Cases commonly referred to as con the court. (See reverse side of management cases.)	iplex and that	need special	or intense management by	Δ			
(f) Standard Management – Cas	es that do not	fall into any	one of the other tracks.	(X)			
July 28, 2017	Mobile	1	Plaintiff				
Date	Attorney-at	-law	Attorney for				
516-222-1600	516-222-0513		jan@frankelnewfiel	jan@frankelnewfield.com			
Telephone	FAX Numb	er	E-Mail Address				
(Civ. 660) 10/02							

JUL 31 2017.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JULIA LONOCONUS, :

Plaintiff,

- against - : ECF CASE

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA,

COMPLAINT

Defendant. :

Plaintiff, Julia Lonoconus, by and through her attorneys, FRANKEL & NEWFIELD, P.C., as and for her Complaint against Defendant LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA ("LINA"), hereby sets forth the following:

THE PARTIES

- At all times hereinafter mentioned, Plaintiff Julia Lonoconus was and still is a resident of the State of Maryland.
- 2. Upon information and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA is a Pennsylvania corporation, and a subsidiary of CIGNA, with its principal place of business at Two Liberty Place, 1601 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Defendant LINA is therefore a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. Jurisdiction of the Court is based upon 29 U.S.C. §§ 1132(e)(1) and 1132(f), which give the District Courts jurisdiction to hear civil actions brought to recover benefits due under the terms of an employee welfare benefit plan. Jurisdiction is also founded on 28 U.S.C. §1331 because this action arises under 29 U.S.C. §1001 et. seq. (Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, hereinafter "ERISA").
- 4. Venue in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania is appropriate because Defendant conducts business and is subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district and maintains contacts in this judicial district sufficient to subject it to personal jurisdiction.
- 5. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(a)(1) and §1391(c), this action is properly venued in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

FACTS

- 6. At all relevant times hereinafter mentioned, Plaintiff was an employee of PPL Services Corporation ("PPL"), employed as a Security Shift Supervisor.
- 7. During Plaintiff's employment with PPL, LINA issued Group Long Term Disability policy number LK0030562 to PPL (the "Policy").
- 8. At all times hereinafter mentioned, said disability policy of insurance was issued for the benefit of certain eligible PPL employees in exchange for the payment of premiums by PPL and/or the employees.
- 9. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was an employee eligible for disability benefits and an insured under the Policy issued by LINA.

- 10. On or about November 22, 2013, during the period within which said Policy was in full force and effect, and while Plaintiff was an eligible employee, Plaintiff became disabled within the meaning and pursuant to the terms of said disability policy.
- 11. As of this date, Plaintiff continues to be disabled in that she is unable to perform all of the essential duties of her regular occupation due to her sickness or injury.
- 12. Plaintiff's disability is caused by herniated discs, degenerative disc disease, arthritis, fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue, plantar fasciitis, and chronic pain and the resulting restrictions and limitations in functionality sustained by Plaintiff from these conditions.
- 13. Plaintiff filed a timely claim, cooperated with Defendant LINA in all respects, provided proper proof of loss in support of his claim, and otherwise complied with the policy terms and conditions regarding the filing and maintenance of a claim.
- 14. Pursuant to the policy, Defendant LINA was obligated to commence the periodic payment of monthly long-term disability benefits to Plaintiff following the expiration of her elimination period.
- 15. Defendant LINA initially accepted liability of the claim, and began paying benefits until such benefits were wrongfully terminated when Defendant LINA issued its adverse benefit determination to Plaintiff on or about July 25, 2016.
- 16. Plaintiff appealed Defendant LINA's denial of further long-term disability benefits on or about September 19, 2016, providing additional medical evidence and other information and support for her continued eligibility for benefits under the policy.

3

- 17. Defendant LINA upheld its termination of benefits on appeal on or about December 2, 2016.
- 18. Despite Plaintiff's continued total disability, Defendant LINA has denied all further disability insurance benefits as of July 25, 2016 and continues to refuse to pay benefits pursuant to the policy, although payment thereof has been duly demanded.
- 19. Defendant's refusal to pay further benefits is a willful and wrongful breach of the policy terms and conditions.
- 20. Monthly benefits to Plaintiff are continuing to be due and payable by Defendant with the passage of each month.
- 21. Defendant LINA is a conflicted decision maker because it has a financial interest in the outcome of Plaintiff's claim, and the payment of any such benefits comes at the financial expense of Defendant LINA.
- 22. Defendant LINA's structural conflict of interest pervaded its handling of Plaintiff's claim, resulting in a number of procedural irregularities in its claim handling, including but not limited to: the failure to consider the impact of Plaintiff's comorbid conditions and limitations on her ability to perform all of the essential duties of her own occupation; the refusal to consider Plaintiff's credible subjective complaints upon her inability to work; the requirement to provide objective evidence of disability despite the Policy not containing such a requirement; the reliance upon a selective review of medical records to reach a result oriented claim determination; the failure to utilize appropriately qualified and unbiased medical personnel to reach decisions and/or render opinions on levels of impairment; the biased and flawed vocational consideration of Plaintiff's claim; the failure to perform a fair and neutral evaluation of Plaintiff's medical

4

conditions and associated restrictions and limitations; and other biased claim handling conduct.

- 23. Defendant LINA's claim handling resulted in numerous violations of 29 CFR § 2560.503-1, et seq.
- 24. The California Department of Insurance has investigated LINA's claim handling and issued a report that details how LINA has improperly denied claims. (Exhibit "A").
- 25. All findings against LINA apply equally to LINA as the employees, upon information and belief, of LINA handle all LINA claims.
 - 26. The California Department of Insurance determined that LINA:
 - a. Failed to adopt and implement reasonable standards for the prompt investigation and processing of claims arising under its insurance policies;
 - b. Failed to effectuate prompt, fair and equitable settlements of claims in which liability had become reasonably clear;
 - c. Failed to represent correctly to claimants, pertinent facts or insurance policy provisions relating to a coverage at issue;
 - d. Compelled insureds to institute litigation to recover amounts under an insurance policy by offering substantially less than the amounts ultimately recovered in actions brought by the insureds, when the insureds have made claims for amounts reasonably similar to amounts ultimately recovered;
 - e. Attempted to settle a claim by making a settlement offer that was unreasonably low;
 - f. Failed to include a statement in its claim denial that, if the claimant believes the claim has been wrongfully denied or rejected, he or she may have the matter reviewed by the appropriate State insurance agency/department.

- 28. Underlying these findings were the facts that LINA:
 - a. Applied arbitrary deadlines for submission of proof of claim after the notice of claim had been denied. If the proof was not available or received within the designated period then the claim was denied and pushed to the appeal process;
 - b. Failed to request medical records prior to making a claim determination;
 - c. Failed to perform any functional testing or peer review of medical records on file while utilizing functional test results as the guidepost for medical information necessary to the entitlement to benefits;
 - d. Failed to consult with a health care professional who had appropriate training and experience in the field of medicine involved in the medical judgment;
 - e. Improperly utilized attending physician's statements to support its denial of disability while not clarifying with the attending physician why he/she was indicating continuing disability;
 - f. Failed to perform a transferable skills analysis and labor market survey to identify alternate occupations appropriate to claimants under an "any occupation" policy;
 - g. Ignored substantial information that was introduced after the claim denial;
 - h. Failed to investigate the course and nature of a claimant's disabling condition as it related to the first date missed from work and the end of the waiting period;
 - i. Assumed that alternate employers could make an accommodation for a claimant, but never provided any documentation to support its assertion;
 - j. Denied claims based upon a "national economy" definition when it was supposed to evaluate a claimant's disability from his/her own occupation;
 - k. Failed to consider the course and nature of an illness prior to denying benefits;

- l. Ignored the medical assessments of its own medical health professionals, who determined that the claimants were disabled, and denied benefits;
- m. Removed several disabling health conditions from a claimant's history on file prior to requesting an internal health care professional to review the claimant's file;
- n. Ignored correspondence received after the initial denial that reasonably required a response;
- o. Failed to clarify a claimant's restrictions and limitations with the attending physician who was indicating the claimant was disabled; and
- p. Failed to provide complete information in the file to the health care expert performing a peer review of the medical file.
- 29. The California Department of Insurance conducted a follow up examination regarding the market conduct examination of LINA of June 20, 2006 and issued a report that details how LINA has continued to improperly deny claims. (Exhibit "B")
 - 30. This follow up examination determined that LINA:
 - a. Failed to utilize the proper medical specialist to review and opine on the claimants' medical records;
 - b. Failed to perform an FCE, an IME, or cognitive testing when the claimant's restrictions and limitations were not clear;
 - c. Failed to obtain complete job descriptions and transferable skills analysis;
 - d. Obtain or consider all medical records relating to the claimant's disability;
 - e. Obtain or consider complete records relating to an award of workers compensation benefits;
 - f. Obtain or consider complete social security disability income records relating to an award of benefits;

- g. Determine an appropriate estimate state disability income offsets and verify the actual benefits received in a time manner and instead applied the maximum state disability income offset;
- h. Failed to address correspondence.
- 31. In 2013, Defendant agreed to a regulatory settlement, wherein it agreed to take certain corrective actions, all related to the Market Conduct Survey which had been conducted. (Exhibit "C")
- 32. Defendant's conduct in this case shares many of the same concerns from the insurance department market conduct examination and the issues involved with the Regulatory Settlement Agreement.
- 33. Defendant LINA's claim handling demonstrates a bias against Plaintiff's claim due to its impact on Defendant LINA's financial situation and frustrated Plaintiff from receiving a full and fair review of her claim.
- 34. Defendant LINA has a history of biased claim administration of ERISA disability claims, and has undertaken no efforts to ensure that its claim handling is not influenced by its financial conflict of interest.
- 35. Defendant is held to "higher than marketplace" standards of quality, as espoused in Met Life v. Glenn, 128 S.Ct. 2343 (2008).
- 36. Defendant was required to discharge its duties "solely in the interests of the participants and beneficiaries of the plan."
- 37. Defendant violated the higher than marketplace standards of quality in its handling of Plaintiff's claim.